

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of) **MAIL STOP AMENDMENT**
Eckhard Kruse et al.)
Application No.: 10/552,479) Group Art Unit: 2447
Filed: September 1, 2006) Examiner: Danilo Jimenez
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR) Confirmation No.: 8919
PRODUCING WEB PAGES)
MATCHED TO CLIENT)
PROPERTIES)

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is a full and timely response to the final Office Action dated January 6, 2010. Claims 1-19 remain pending. By this communication, claims Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested based upon the comments that follow.

In numbered paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner claims 1-9 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged unpatentability over the *Kitayama et al* (EP 0969389 A2) in view of *McCartney et al* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010716); and in numbered paragraph 3 on page 10 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for allegedly being unpatentable over *Kitayama* in view of *McCartney* and further in view of *La Porte et al* (WO 02/23375A2). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The combination of *Kitayama* and *McCartney* fails to disclose each and every feature recited in independent claims 1 and 12. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that *Kitayama* discloses every feature recited in Applicants' claims except that the